

Critical parameters for quantum wells from a local approximation

Francisco M Fernández and Javier Garcia

INIFTA (UNLP, CCT La Plata-CONICET), División Química Teórica, Blvd. 113
S/N, Sucursal 4, Casilla de Correo 16, 1900 La Plata, Argentina

E-mail: fernande@quimica.unlp.edu.ar

Abstract. We apply the Riccati-Padé method to one-dimensional quantum wells. The approach is based on a rational approximation to the logarithmic derivative of the wavefunction. We modify the Riccati-Padé method and calculate accurate critical parameters for the Gaussian well and the Yukawa potential. The application of perturbation theory to a rational potentials yields interesting and baffling unphysical results.

1. Introduction

The accurate calculation of the number of bound states supported by a finite quantum-mechanical potential well is of great physical and mathematical importance and for this reason there has been considerable interest in the derivation of upper and lower bounds [1–13]. Most of those bounds are given in terms of the potential-energy function. In a recent paper Liverts and Barnea [14] proceeded in a different way and proposed the calculation of the critical parameters for negative central-field quantum wells. To this end they applied two exact methods and the WKB approach, the latter for the estimation of the large-quantum number behaviour of the critical parameters. In this context a critical parameter is the value of a potential parameter for which an energy eigenvalue is exactly zero (what the authors call a transition state). Obviously, if we know a critical parameter for a given potential we also know the number of bound states supported by it.

Local methods, like, for example, a power-series approach, are expected to be unsuitable for the calculation of critical parameters. Even the Riccati-Padé method (RPM [15, 16]), based on Padé approximants was shown to be unsuccessful for the calculation of the eigenvalues of the Yukawa potential close to the zero-energy threshold (transition state) [15]. The purpose of this paper is to investigate in more detail whether those earlier results already prove that the RPM is actually useless for the calculation of critical parameters.

In section 2 we outline the main ideas of the RPM. In section 3 we briefly discuss

the solutions of the Schrödinger equation with even-parity potential wells. In section 4 we apply the approach to some simple one-dimensional models. In section 5 we propose a modified version of the RPM that is suitable for the calculation of critical parameters and apply it to the Gaussian well. In section 6 we apply the modified RPM to the s-states of central-field models and choose the Yukawa potential as a suitable illustrative example. In section 7 we discuss the application of perturbation theory to a model with a rational potential that is exactly solvable at threshold. Finally, in section 8 we summarize the main results and draw conclusions.

2. The Riccati-Padé method

We consider the eigenvalue equation

$$\psi''(x) + Q(E, x)\psi(x) = 0, \quad -\infty < x < \infty \quad (1)$$

where E is the eigenvalue. We assume that $\psi(x)$ can be expanded about the origin as

$$\psi(x) = x^\alpha \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j x^{\beta j}, \quad \alpha, \beta > 0 \quad (2)$$

It is clear that

$$f(x) = \frac{s}{x} - \frac{\psi'(x)}{\psi(x)} \quad (3)$$

can be expanded about the origin as

$$f(x) = x^{\beta-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_j z^j, \quad z = x^\beta \quad (4)$$

We approximate $f(x)$ by means of a rational function of the form $x^{\beta-1}[M/N](z)$ where

$$[M/N](z) = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^M a_j z^j}{\sum_{j=0}^N b_j z^j} = T(M+N+1, z) + O(z^{M+N+2}) \quad (5)$$

and

$$T(n, z) = \sum_{j=0}^n f_j z^j \quad (6)$$

We choose $M \geq N$ and define $d = M - N$. It is not possible to satisfy the condition (5) unless $H_D^d = |f_{i+j+d-1}|_{i,j=1}^D = 0$, $D = N + 1$. The coefficients f_j , and thereby the

Hankel determinant H_D^d , depend on the eigenvalue E . From the roots of $H_D^d(E) = 0$ we obtain sequences $E^{[D,d]}$, $D = 2, 3, \dots$ that converge toward the eigenvalues of Eq. (1).

The ordinary Padé approximation to $f(x)$ is

$$[M/N](z) = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^M a_j z^j}{\sum_{j=0}^N b_j z^j} = T(M+N, z) + O(z^{M+N+1}) \quad (7)$$

If z_0 is a zero of the denominator then

$$z_0 = -\frac{b_{N-1}}{b_N} - \frac{b_{N-2}}{b_N z_0} - \dots - \frac{b_0}{b_N z_0^{N-1}} \quad (8)$$

Suppose that E^* is a zero of $b_N(E) = 0$ and that $b_{N-1}(E)$ does not exhibit a zero in the interval $(E^* - \epsilon, E^* + \epsilon)$. Therefore $|z_0| \rightarrow \infty$ as $E \rightarrow E^*$. The coefficient b_N is proportional to the Hankel determinant $H_{N-1}^{d+1}(E)$ so that the Hankel condition $H_D^d(E) = 0$ is equivalent to moving a pole of a rational approximation towards infinity [17]. It is also equivalent to moving a zero of the approximate $\psi(x)$ towards infinity. For this reason the Hankel condition is equivalent to selecting bound states that vanish at infinity.

3. Parity-invariant finite wells

The Riccati-Padé method is known to produce accurate eigenvalues for infinite wells or sufficiently deep finite ones. The purpose of this section is to investigate to which extent it is possible to apply the RPM to shallow wells. To this end we consider the eigenvalue equation (1) with

$$Q(x) = 2[E - V(x)] \quad (9)$$

where the potential-energy function $V(x)$ exhibits a minimum at $V(0) < 0$ and $V(x \rightarrow \pm\infty) = 0$. In order to simplify the discussion we assume that $V(-x) = V(x)$ so that

$$Q(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Q_j x^{2j} \quad (10)$$

The shape of a parity-invariant potential is commonly determined by a smaller number of parameters. In addition to it, the results for the odd states also apply to the solutions

of the Schrödinger equation with a central-field potential having zero angular momentum quantum number l (s states).

The eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian operator with a parity-invariant potential are even or odd; therefore, $s = 0$ for the former, $s = 1$ for the latter and $\beta = 2$ in both cases. We thus have

$$f(x) = x \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_j x^{2j} \quad (11)$$

where the first coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= \frac{Q_0}{1+2s} \\ f_1 &= \frac{Q_0^2}{(3+2s)(1+2s)^2} + \frac{Q_1}{3+2s} \\ f_2 &= \frac{2Q_0^3}{(5+2s)(3+2s)(1+2s)^3} + \frac{2Q_0Q_1}{(5+2s)(1+2s)(3+2s)} + \frac{Q_2}{(5+2s)} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Besides, the function $f(x)$ is a solution to the Riccati equation

$$f'(x) + \frac{2s}{x}f(x) - f(x)^2 - Q(x) = 0 \quad (13)$$

For convenience we define $v_0 = -V(0) > 0$ and $v(x) = -V(x)/v_0$. For all values of the well depth $v_0 > 0$ there is always a bound ground state with energy E_0 . The number of bound states with energies $E_0 < E_1 < \dots < E_n < 0$ depends on v_0 . As v_0 decreases the highest bound-state energy, say E_n , approaches the threshold $E = 0$ from below and we have a critical well parameter $v_{0,n}$ when $E_n = 0$.

We assume that $V(x)$ vanishes faster than x^{-2} ; that is to say

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} x^2 V(x) = 0 \quad (14)$$

Therefore, an eigenfunction for the arbitrary energy $E < 0$ behaves asymptotically as

$$\psi(x) \sim A(E, v_0)e^{-\alpha x} + B(E, v_0)e^{\alpha x}, \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty \quad (15)$$

where $\alpha = \sqrt{-2E}$. The bound states are given by the condition $B(E_j, v_0) = 0$ that leads to square-integrable eigenfunctions.

When $E = 0$ the two asymptotic solutions in Eq. (15) are linearly dependent. In this case the general solution to $\psi''(x) = 0$ behaves as

$$\psi(x) \sim A(v_0) + B(v_0)x, \quad E = 0, \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty \quad (16)$$

The solution at threshold is not square integrable but we can think of it as the limit of a square integrable one $\lim_{E \rightarrow 0} A(E, v_0)e^{-\alpha x} = A(v_0)$ ($|x| \rightarrow \infty$). Therefore, the critical parameters are roots of $B(v_{0,n}) = 0$ and the boundary condition at threshold is

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(x) = 0, \quad E = 0 \quad (17)$$

In their study of central-field quantum wells Liverts and Barnea [14] assumed the boundary condition $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |\psi|^2 = 0$ for the transition states with $E = 0$. This boundary condition may be valid for nonzero angular-momentum quantum number ($l > 0$) but it does not apply to $l = 0$ where the asymptotic behaviour is similar to (16). In fact their equation (24) for $l = 0$ is similar to our equation (17).

4. Examples

In what follows we discuss some simple model potentials to illustrate the application of the RPM.

4.1. Modified Pöschl-Teller potential

As a first example we consider the modified Pöschl-Teller potential

$$V(x) = -\frac{v_0}{\cosh^2(x)}, \quad v_0 > 0 \quad (18)$$

There are two reason for this choice: first, we can solve the Schrödinger equation and obtain a simple expression for the eigenvalues: [18]

$$\begin{aligned} E_n &= -\frac{(\lambda - n - 1)^2}{2}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots \\ \lambda &= \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 8v_0}}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Second, the exact bound-state solutions are hypergeometric functions of $y = \cosh^2 x$ so that the RPM based on an x -power series can only yield approximate results. Therefore, this model is a suitable benchmark for testing the performance of the approach.

As discussed above the critical values of the potential parameter v_0 are determined by the condition $E_n(v_{0,n}) = 0$. It follows from equation (19) that $v_{0,n} = n(n+1)/2$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$. We first investigate if there are converging sequences of roots $E^{[D,d]}$ of the Hankel determinant H_D^d as v_0 approaches $v_{0,0} = 0$ and $v_{0,2} = 3$. We calculated $E^{[D,0]}$, $D = 2, 3, \dots$ for $v_0 = v_{0,n} + 10^{-k}$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$. The results show that there are convergent sequences of roots for $D = D_k, D_k + 1, \dots$ and that the starting point of each sequence D_k increases as k increases. There seems to be convergent sequences no matter how large the value of k . In other words, the RPM appears to be successful no matter how close v_0 is to the critical value $v_{0,n}$.

Since the roots of the Hankel determinants $H_D^d(E, v_0) = 0$ give rise to sequences that clearly converge towards the eigenvalues $E_n(v_0)$ for v_0 quite close to $v_{0,n}$, then one would expect to find sequences of roots of $H_D^d(E = 0, v_0) = 0$ that converge towards the critical parameters $v_{0,n}$. This is exactly the case for this model and one obtains the critical parameters with any desired degree of accuracy with Hankel determinants of relatively small dimension. There are, however, two surprising facts. The first one is that the RPM yields all the critical parameters $v_{0,n}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$ when choosing either the even ($s = 0$) or odd ($s = 1$) functions. One would expect the even or odd values of n to appear separately with even or odd functions, respectively. The second surprising fact is that the RPM with $s = 0$ yields the critical parameters with odd n more accurately than those with even n . The opposite situation takes place when choosing $s = 1$.

We can understand the occurrence of twice as much critical parameters as expected by obtaining the corresponding wave functions in the usual way [18]. If $\psi_{n,s}(x)$ denotes the solution of parity s for $v_0 = v_{0,n}$ and $E = 0$, then the first of them are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_{1,0}(x) &= \frac{2x}{e^{2x} + 1} - x + 1 \\
\psi_{1,1}(x) &= 1 - \frac{2}{e^{2x} + 1} \\
\psi_{2,0}(x) &= \frac{2(4e^{2x} - e^{4x} - 1)}{e^{4x} + 2e^{2x} + 1} \\
\psi_{2,1}(x) &= -\frac{[e^{4x}(2x - 3) - 8xe^{2x} + 2x + 3]}{4(e^{4x} + 2e^{2x} + 1)}
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

We appreciate that $\psi_{1,1}(x)$ and $\psi_{2,0}(x)$ are convergent while $\psi_{1,0}(x)$ and $\psi_{2,1}(x)$ are divergent. In general, $\psi_{n,s}$ is convergent or divergent provided that $n + s$ is even or odd, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{n,s}(x) &= A, \quad n + s = 2k \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1} \psi_{n,s}(x) &= B, \quad n + s = 2k - 1 \\ k &= 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We conclude that the RPM approaches both the convergent and divergent solutions for this problem when $E = 0$. This is the reason why the whole set of critical parameters $v_{0,n}$ appears for both the even and odd solutions: half of them are convergent and the other half divergent. It is clear, as already argued above, that the RPM does not yield the exact result because $f(x)$ is not a rational function of x for any of the functions (20).

It is not clear to us why the RPM with $s = 0$ ($s = 1$) yields the critical parameters with odd (even) n more accurately. We will discuss this point with somewhat more detail later on by means of another solvable model.

4.2. Gaussian well

The Gaussian well

$$V(x) = -v_0 e^{-x^2} \tag{22}$$

is another suitable choice because the potential is extremely simple but the Schrödinger equation is not exactly solvable. In this case the behaviour of the sequences of roots of $H_D^d(E, v_0) = 0$ appears to be similar except that the starting point D_k of a given sequence increases more pronouncedly as v_0 approaches $v_{0,n}$ and we could not find converging sequences of roots of $H_D^d(E = 0, v_0) = 0$. It is not clear to us which is the feature of this well that makes such a difference. The present form of the RPM is unsuitable for obtaining the critical parameters for this problem and in Sec. 5 we will discuss an improved version of the approach.

4.3. Rational potential

The third example in this section is the potential well

$$V(x) = -\frac{v_0}{(1+x^2)^2} \quad (23)$$

that satisfies the condition (14). Joseph [19] studied the family of central-field potentials $V(r) = -\lambda r^{\alpha-2}(r_0^2 + r^2)^{-\alpha}$ in his discussion of local degeneracy. Clearly, the potential (23) is the one-dimensional version of the case $\alpha = 2$. Besides, present results for the odd states should agree with those obtained by Joseph for $\alpha = 2$ and $l = 0$.

The roots of the Hankel determinants $H_D^0(E = 0, v_0)$ yield exact critical parameters $v_{0,n} = n(n+2)/2$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. These results correspond to exact rational solutions to the Riccati equation (13). In order to understand their meaning we construct the corresponding wavefunctions as

$$\psi_{n,s} = x^s \exp \left[- \int f(x) dx \right] \quad (24)$$

The first even and odd ones are

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{1,0}(x) &= \frac{1-x^2}{\sqrt{x^2+1}} \\ \psi_{2,0}(x) &= \frac{1-3x^2}{x^2+1} \\ \psi_{3,0}(x) &= \frac{(x^2+2x-1)(x^2-2x-1)}{(1+x^2)^{3/2}} \\ \psi_{4,0}(x) &= \frac{5x^4-10x^2+1}{(1+x^2)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{1,1}(x) &= \frac{x}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} \\ \psi_{2,1}(x) &= \frac{x(x^2-3)}{1+x^2} \\ \psi_{3,1}(x) &= \frac{x(x^2-1)}{(1+x^2)^{3/2}} \\ \psi_{4,1}(x) &= \frac{x(x^4-10x^2+5)}{(1+x^2)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

respectively. As in the case of the modified Pöschl-Teller potential the solutions $\psi_{n,s}$ are convergent or divergent provided that $n + s$ is even or odd, respectively; more precisely, they satisfy equations (21). According to the discussion of Sec. 3 $\psi_{2k,0}(x)$ are the even solutions to the Schrödinger equation for $E = 0$ and $v_0 = 2k(k+1)$ (satisfy the condition $B(v_0) = 0$). On the other hand, $\psi_{2k-1,1}(x)$ are the odd solutions for $E = 0$ and $v_0 = (4k^2 - 1)/2$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. The latter agree with Joseph's ones when $\lambda = 2v_0$ [19]. The remaining solutions $\psi_{2k,1}(x)$ and $\psi_{2k-1,0}(x)$ are the unphysical divergent solutions to the Schrödinger equation. We see that the RPM yields the exact convergent and divergent solutions to the Schrödinger equation with the potential (23) when $E = 0$. It is worth noting that the RPM does not distinguish between physical and unphysical results unless one manages to obtain the wavefunction from its logarithmic derivative as we did it in this example. In other cases, like the potential (18), it may be easier to resort to another approach to obtain the wavefunction from the parameters given by the RPM.

In the appendix we solve the Schrödinger equation for this potential and derive the exact convergent and divergent solutions for $E = 0$.

Although the RPM yields the exact critical parameters it is not suitable for the calculation of the energies close to threshold. The sequence of roots of $H_D^d(E, v_0) = 0$ converge rather too slowly when v_0 is close (slightly greater than) a critical parameter. When $E < 0$ the function $f(x)$ is not an exact rational function and the RPM yields approximately those eigenvalues that are not too close to threshold. We calculated the ground state for $v_0 = 3/2$ ($E_1 = 0$) and the first two bound states for $v_0 = 4$ ($E_2 = 0$). In the three cases we found that the sequences $E^{[D,0]}$ converge from above and the sequences $E^{[D,1]}$ from below. We assume that the former provides upper bounds and the latter lower ones as in an earlier treatment of the quartic anharmonic oscillator [15, 16]. Thus, from sequences of roots with $D \leq 45$ we conjecture that

$$\begin{aligned} -0.698526217161 &> E_0 > -0.698526217173, v_0 = \frac{3}{2} \\ -2.4713450252412632 &> E_0 > -2.4713450252412641, v_0 = 4 \end{aligned}$$

$$-0.426405989 > E_1 > -0.426405991, v_0 = 4 \quad (27)$$

We are not aware of any calculation of the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions for this rational potential.

5. Modified RPM for critical parameters

According to the results of Sec. 3 the appropriate boundary condition at threshold is given by equation (17). Therefore, since the RPM moves a pole of $f(x)$ (a zero of $\psi(x)$) to infinity it seems reasonable to apply the RPM to the function

$$g(x) = \frac{1-s}{x} - \frac{\psi''(x)}{\psi'(x)} \quad (28)$$

We thus have

$$\frac{1-s}{x}f(x) - f(x)g(x) + \frac{s}{x}g(x) = Q(E, x) \quad (29)$$

and

$$g(x) = x \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} g_j x^{2j} \quad (30)$$

The first coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} g_0 &= \frac{Q_0}{3} - \frac{2Q_1}{3Q_0} \\ g_1 &= \frac{Q_0^2}{45} - \frac{4Q_2}{5Q_0} + \frac{2Q_1^2}{9Q_0^2} + \frac{11Q_1}{45} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

for $s = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} g_0 &= Q_0 \\ g_1 &= Q_1 + \frac{1}{3}Q_0^2 \\ g_2 &= Q_2 + \frac{8}{15}Q_0Q_1 + \frac{2}{15}Q_0^3 \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

for $s = 1$. We apply the RPM exactly in the same way and construct the Hankel determinants with the coefficients g_j : $H_D^d(E, v_0) = |g_{i+j+d-1}(E, v_0)|_{i,j=1}^D = 0$.

We obtain convergent sequences of roots of $H_D^d(E = 0, v_0) = 0$ for all the models discussed above. In particular, Table 1 shows the first critical parameters for the

Gaussian well estimated from the roots of the Hankel determinants with $D \leq 45$, $d = 0$ and $d = 1$. For comparison we add the results of Liverts and Barnea [14] for the s-states of the central-field model. The critical parameters for the central-field model with angular momentum quantum number $l = 0$ are exactly those for the odd states of the one-dimensional case.

6. Central-field models

The results of Sec. 5 suggest that present approach may also be suitable for the s-states of other central-field models. Although the present paper is focused on one-dimensional parity-invariant models we can outline a strategy for the treatment of central-field models. We write the radial part of the dimensionless Schrödinger equation as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi''(r) + \left[Q(r) - \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2} \right] \psi(r) &= 0 \\ Q(r) &= 2[E - V(r)], \psi(0) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

and assume that

$$Q(r) = \sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} Q_j r^j \quad (34)$$

As in earlier papers we define [15]

$$f(r) = \frac{l+1}{r} - \frac{\psi'(r)}{\psi(r)} \quad (35)$$

but in order to apply the RPM to the calculation of critical parameters we resort to the auxiliary function

$$g(r) = \frac{l}{r} - \frac{\psi''(r)}{\psi'(r)} \quad (36)$$

They are related by

$$\frac{l+1}{r} g(r) - f(r) g(r) + \frac{l}{r} f(r) - Q(r) = 0 \quad (37)$$

and can be expanded in a Taylor series about the origin as

$$\begin{aligned} f(r) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_j r^j \\ g(r) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} g_j r^j \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

As an illustrative example we choose the Yukawa potential

$$V(r) = -\frac{v_0 e^{-r}}{r} \quad (39)$$

and show the results in Table 2 for the first s-states estimated from roots of the Hankel determinants with $D \leq 45$, $d = 0$ and $d = 1$. Present results agree with those of Liverts and Barnea [14] and Singh and Varshni [22] up to the last digit reported by them.

Although present results are more accurate than those of Liverts and Barnea [14] and Singh and Varshni [22] one should not conclude that the RPM is superior to the approaches developed by those authors. Those other methods are more general and apply to all the states of the quantum wells. However, the RPM is a straightforward simple approach that applies to a wide variety of problems. In many cases it yields quite accurate results and may be suitable for testing other approaches and even for setting benchmark data.

7. Perturbation theory about the threshold

We can expand the exact energy (19) for the modified Pöschl-Teller potential in a Taylor series about $v_{0,n}$ and obtain the perturbation series about the threshold

$$\begin{aligned} E_n &= -\frac{2\xi^2}{(2n+1)^2} + \frac{8\xi^3}{(2n+1)^4} - \frac{40\xi^4}{(2n+1)^6} + \frac{224\xi^5}{(2n+1)^8} + O(\xi^6) \\ \xi &= v_0 - v_{0,n} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

that converges for all $|\xi| < (2n+1)^2/8$. Note that the perturbation correction of first order is zero for all states and that we obtain a negative energy for both $v_0 > v_{0,n}$ and $v_0 < v_{0,n}$ if ξ is sufficiently small, in spite of the fact that n -th state moves into the continuum in the latter case. We can carry out a similar calculation for models that are not exactly solvable by means of the RPM. In what follows we illustrate the strategy by means of the apparently most favourable case of the rational potential (23) for which the RPM yields the exact solution at threshold.

The roots of a Hankel determinant $H_D^d(E, v_0) = 0$ give us approximations to either

$E(v_0)$ or $v_0(E)$. If we substitute

$$E = E^{(1)}\xi + E^{(2)}\xi^2 + \dots + E^{(k)}\xi^k \quad (41)$$

and $v_0 = v_{0,n} + \xi$ into the Hankel determinant, then we can obtain the coefficients $E^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ of the perturbation series, the accuracy increasing with D . Based on the Hellmann-Feynman theorem

$$\frac{dE}{dv_0} = - \left\langle \frac{1}{(1+x^2)^2} \right\rangle \quad (42)$$

we expect that

$$E^{(1)} = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{dE}{d\xi} \leq 0 \quad (43)$$

for a physically acceptable solution. Since the solutions are not square integrable when $\xi = 0$ then the expectation value in equation (42) is meaningless at threshold; however the limit (43) may hopefully be finite. In fact, $E^{(1)} = 0$ for the Pöschl-Teller potential.

It follows from the discussion in the subsection 4.3 that $E_1 = 0$ when $v_0 = 3/2$. However, if we substitute $v_0 = 3/2 + \xi$ and the series (41) into the Hankel determinants for $s = 1$ we obtain the unphysical result

$$E = \frac{1}{8}\xi - \frac{7}{64}\xi^2 + \frac{29}{768}\xi^3 - \frac{1847}{184320}\xi^4 + \frac{275357}{77414400}\xi^5 + O(\xi^6) \quad (44)$$

According to this expansion the energy increases as v_0 increases beyond $v_{0,1} = 3/2$ in contradiction with (42) and (43). This result reflects the fact mentioned above that the RPM does not yield the energy E_1 for v_0 close to threshold.

If we repeat the calculation for the even states we obtain a perturbation expansion with the expected slope at threshold:

$$E = -\frac{1}{8}\xi + \frac{17}{192}\xi^2 - \frac{23}{11520}\xi^3 - \frac{271933}{19353600}\xi^4 + \frac{29363423}{8128512000}\xi^5 + O(\xi^6) \quad (45)$$

At first sight, this result is surprising because no new even state should appear when $3/2 < v_0 < 4$ (the ground state remains bound for all $v_0 > 0$). The explanation is that the RPM yields a spurious even-state energy associated to the divergent solution $\psi_{1,0}$. For example, when $v_0 = 1.51$ the RPM with $D = 10$ and $d = 0$ yields the actual ground-state energy $E_0 \approx -0.70483$ and the spurious root $W \approx -0.00124114797000675832$.

The considerably greater accuracy of the latter is due to the fact that the RPM yields the exact result when $v_0 = 3/2$. The question remains why the RPM does not yield the energy E_1 of the odd state in view of the fact that the calculation of the critical parameter is also exact in this case. The perturbation expansion (44) with the wrong slope at threshold also describes a spurious root. For example, when $v_0 = 1.49$ the roots of the Hankel determinants with $D = 10$ and $d = 0$ yields $W \approx -0.0012609753609799139195$ ($s = 1$) and $E_0 \approx -0.692231$ ($s = 0$). It is clear that the RPM favours the unphysical solutions; in fact, it is also interesting that the spurious roots of the Hankel determinants follow the unphysical expansions (45) and (44) for both $\xi < 0$ and $\xi > 0$ and in either case the rate of convergence of the corresponding sequences is remarkably large. For example, the expansion (45) predicts a positive root for a negative value of ξ and the RPM already yields it quite accurately. When $v_0 = 1.49$ we obtain $W = 0.0012588560223263235359$ in agreement with that perturbation series.

The second excited state vanishes when $v_0 = 4$. The RPM perturbation expansions obtained by substitution of $v_0 = 4 + \xi$ are also unphysical. For example when $s = 0$ we obtain a series with the wrong slope at threshold:

$$E = \frac{1}{32}\xi - \frac{23}{2304}\xi^2 - \frac{919}{331776}\xi^3 + \frac{100843}{59719680}\xi^4 - \frac{418250431}{1203948748800}\xi^5 + O(\xi^6) \quad (46)$$

This results is not surprising if we take into account that the RPM fails to give us the second excited state when v_0 is slightly larger than 4. When $s = 1$ we obtain the exact power series for another unphysical root of the Hankel determinants

$$E = -\frac{1}{32}\xi + \frac{7}{768}\xi^2 + \frac{1921}{552960}\xi^3 - \frac{1186027}{696729600}\xi^4 + \frac{2551967839}{14046068736000}\xi^5 + O(\xi^6) \quad (47)$$

From the roots of the Hankel determinants for $v_0 = 4.01$ we obtain $E_1 \approx -0.429395$ (the actual energy for the first-excited state) and the spurious eigenvalue $W \approx -0.00031158508464057747545$ which is associated to the divergent function $\psi_{2,1}$ when $\xi \rightarrow 0$ ($E \rightarrow 0^-$).

For some unknown reason the RPM yields the unphysical roots associated to the divergent states more accurately than the physical ones stemming from the convergent

states. However, the approach is still a useful tool for obtaining the eigenvalues and critical parameters of one-dimensional wells as already shown above. The modified RPM discussed in Sec. 5 also yields the same spurious roots; therefore, we may conclude that such an unexpected behaviour is inherent in the Hankel determinants constructed from either the coefficients f_j or g_j .

Although the RPM yields the whole set of critical values with either the even or odd functions for the modified Pöschl-Teller, the Hankel determinants do not exhibit spurious roots in this case.

8. Conclusions

Despite of being a local approximation the RPM may be a useful tool for the calculation of critical parameters of one-dimensional and central-field quantum wells. In some cases, like the modified Pöschl-Teller and rational potentials, the original version of the approach yields accurate results. In other cases, like the Gaussian potential, it is necessary to resort to a modified algorithm that applies to one-dimensional models as well as to the s-states of central-field ones. The accuracy of the estimated critical parameters is satisfactory for the Gaussian and Yukawa potentials.

In the case of the modified Pöschl-Teller and rational potentials the RPM yields the whole set of critical parameters for both the even and odd solutions to the Schrödinger equation. Half of them are associated to the divergent solutions. The occurrence of unphysical results is due to the fact that the RPM does not take into account the asymptotic behaviour of the eigenfunctions explicitly. For some unknown reason the RPM seems to favour the divergent solutions in the case of the rational potential. This undesirable behaviour is not a serious limitation because there is no doubt about which roots are spurious.

The Pöschl-Teller and rational potentials are different in the sense that the RPM yields accurate energies close to the threshold in the former case but not in the latter one. Therefore, the three one-dimensional potentials discussed in Sec. 4 reveal three

different behaviour patterns in the application of the RPM to simple one-dimensional parity-invariant quantum wells.

The RPM yields the exact solutions for the rational potential (23) when $E = 0$. This particularly fortunate situation enables one to try perturbation theory about the threshold. Surprisingly, the RPM yields exact perturbation series only for the unphysical case of divergent functions. The reason may be that the physically meaningful solutions do not exhibit power-series expansions about threshold. However, we know that such expansions exist in the case of the Pöschl-Teller potential as shown in Eq. (40). In this case the Hankel determinants do not exhibit spurious roots.

We have also carried out calculations for potentials of the form $V(x) = -v_0/(1 + x^2)^m$, where $m = 5/2, 3, 4$. In these cases the RPM fails to provide the critical parameters and the modified RPM exhibits convergent roots. The even and odd critical parameters appear separately as in the case of the Gaussian potential discussed in subsection 4.2.

9. Appendix

If we change the independent and dependent variables in the Schrödinger equation with the rational potential (23) according to

$$\begin{aligned} x &= iz \\ \varphi(z) &= \psi(iz) = \sqrt{1 - z^2} w(z) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

then we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dz} (1 - z^2) \frac{d}{dz} w + \left[-2E (1 - z^2) - \frac{2v_0 + 1}{1 - z^2} \right] w = 0 \quad (49)$$

This equation is a particular case of the spheroidal differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dz} (1 - z^2) \frac{d}{dz} w + \left[\lambda + \gamma^2 (1 - z^2) - \frac{\mu^2}{1 - z^2} \right] w = 0 \quad (50)$$

with $\lambda = 0$, $\gamma^2 = -2E$ and $\mu^2 = 2v_0 + 1$. We can also relate equation (49) with the associated Legendre equation

$$\frac{d}{dz} (1 - z^2) \frac{d}{dz} w + \left[\nu(\nu + 1) - \frac{\mu^2}{1 - z^2} \right] w = 0 \quad (51)$$

when $E = 0$ and $\nu = 0$.

However, for the present discussion we prefer to proceed in a different way. The rational potential (23) exhibits singularities at $x = \pm i$. If we substitute

$$\psi(x) = (1 + x^2)^\alpha u(x) \quad (52)$$

into the Schrödinger equation we obtain an eigenvalue equation for the new dependent variable $u(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left((1 + x^2) u'' + 4\alpha x u' - \frac{2(2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha - v_0)}{1 + x^2} u \right. \\ & \left. + [2Ex^2 + 2(2\alpha^2 - \alpha + E)] u \right) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

We remove the third term by choosing α to be any one of the roots of

$$2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha - v_0 = 0 \quad (54)$$

Then, we expand u in a Taylor series about the origin

$$u(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j x^{2j+s} \quad (55)$$

and derive a three-term recurrence relation for the coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} & (2j + s + 1)(2j + s + 2)c_{j+1} + [(2j + s + 2\alpha)(2j + s + 2\alpha - 1) + 2E] c_j \\ & + 2E c_{j-1} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

The radius of convergence of this series is unity ($\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{c_{j+1}}{c_j} \right| = 1$) because of the singularities at $x = \pm i$. When $E = 0$ the recurrence relation becomes a two-term one and we can obtain polynomial solutions for particular values of α . Note that if

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} \alpha_1(k, s) = -k - \frac{s}{2} \\ \alpha_2(k, s) = -k - \frac{s}{2} + 1 \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

then $c_j = 0$ for all $j > k$. We thus have two sets of critical potential parameters:

$$v_0 = \frac{(2\alpha - 1)^2 - 1}{2} = \begin{cases} v_0^{(1)}(k, s) = \frac{(2k+s-1)^2-1}{2} \\ v_0^{(2)}(k, s) = \frac{(2k+s)^2-1}{2} \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

where $v_0^{(1,2)} = v_0(\alpha_{1,2})$. It is interesting to note that the critical parameters exhibit a kind of degeneracy:

$$v_0^{(1)}(k, 1) = v_0^{(2)}(k, 0) = \frac{4k^2 - 1}{2}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

$$v_0^{(1)}(k+1, 0) = v_0^{(2)}(k, 1) = \frac{(2k+1)^2 - 1}{2}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (59)$$

similar to the one found by Joseph [19, 20] for the central-field version of this model. In the present case one of the degenerate solutions is convergent (~ 1) and the other one is divergent ($\sim x$). The connection between both models becomes apparent if we take into account that the states of the central-field model with angular-momentum quantum numbers $l = -1$ and $l = 0$ become the even and odd states of the one-dimensional one.

In order to understand the results derived in the subsection 4.3 by means of the RPM simply note that

$$f(x) = \frac{s}{x} - \frac{\psi'(x)}{\psi(x)} = \frac{s}{x} - \frac{2\alpha x}{1+x^2} - \frac{u'(x)}{u(x)} \quad (60)$$

is a rational function of x .

- [1] Bargmann V 1952 *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **38** 961.
- [2] Schwinger J 1961 *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **47** 122.
- [3] Ghirardi G C and Rimini A 1965 *J. Math. Phys.* **6** 40.
- [4] Calogero F 1965 *J. Math. Phys.* **6** 161.
- [5] Calogero F 1965 *J. Math. Phys.* **6** 1105.
- [6] Newton R G 1983 *J. Operator Theory* **10** 119.
- [7] Chadan K, Martin A, and Stubbe J 1995 *J. Math. Phys.* **36** 1616.
- [8] Chadan K, Kobayashi R, Martin A, and Stubbe J 1996 *J. Math. Phys.* **37** 1106.
- [9] Chadan K and Kobayashi R 1997 *J. Math. Phys.* **38** 4900.
- [10] Brau F and Calogero F 2003 *J. Math. Phys.* **44** 1554.
- [11] Brau F and Calogero F 2003 *J. Phys. A* **36** 12021.
- [12] Brau F and Calogero F 2004 *Phys. Lett. A* **321** 225.
- [13] Ma Z-Q 2006 *J. Phys. A* **39** R625.
- [14] Liverts E Z and Barnea N 2011 *J. Phys. A* **44** 375303.
- [15] Fernández F M, Ma Q, and Tipping R H 1989 *Phys. Rev. A* **39** 1605.
- [16] Fernández F M, Ma Q, and Tipping R H 1989 *Phys. Rev. A* **40** 6149.
- [17] Abbasbandy S and Bervillier C 2011 *Appl. Math. Comput.* **218** 2178.
- [18] Flügge S 1999 *Practical Quantum Mechanics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin).
- [19] Joseph A 1967 *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1** 615.
- [20] Joseph A 1967 *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1** 535.
- [21] Friedrich H, in Proceedings of the fourth international conference on dynamical systems and differential equations, 2002), p. 288.

Table 1. Critical parameters for the Gaussian well

n	$v_{0,n}$ (present)	$\beta/2$ (Liverts and Barnea)
1	1.342002325462045769136522184	1.3420023
2	4.32454875170105636793006	
3	8.89784977356695359409760	8.89785
4	15.05314025436583553156	
5	22.7867399600521324219	22.78674
6	32.09666656038554310	
7	42.98170019005867753	42.9817
8	55.4410239055636496	
9	69.474057353841774	69.47406
10	85.0803698581927	
11	102.259630867595735	102.25963
12	121.011579785235	
13	141.336006623056	141.33601
14	163.23273906943	
15	186.7016335411	186.70163
16	211.742568809	
17	238.3554413509	238.35544
18	266.540161872	
19	296.29665268	296.29665
20	327.62484562	
21	360.52468057	360.52468

Table 2. Critical parameters for the Yukawa potential

<i>State</i>	$v_{0,n}$ (present)	$\beta/2$ (Liverts and Barnea)	$1/\delta$ (Singh and Varshni)
$1s$	0.83990388669822801527775556	0.83990390	0.839903886698226
$2s$	3.2236301610682666483973	3.2236302	3.22363017
$3s$	7.1710139208439285832	7.1710140	7.17101392
$4s$	12.6858299220239072	12.685830	12.685830
$5s$	19.76942118485633	19.769421	19.769421
$6s$	28.42243219866088	28.42243	28.422432
$7s$	38.645227430528	38.645227	38.645227